

# The Times-Dispatch

Business Office.....916 E. Main Street  
 Richmond, Va.  
 Daily Edition.....\$6.00  
 Sunday Edition.....\$3.00  
 Weekly Edition.....\$1.00

By Mail.....One Year.....\$60.00  
 Six Months.....\$35.00  
 Three Months.....\$20.00  
 Daily Edition.....\$6.00  
 Sunday Edition.....\$3.00  
 Weekly Edition.....\$1.00

By Times-Dispatch Carrier Delivery Service  
 in Richmond and suburbs, Manchester and  
 Petersburg.....One Week.....\$1.00  
 Daily Edition.....\$6.00  
 Sunday Edition.....\$3.00  
 Weekly Edition.....\$1.00

Entered January 27, 1903, at Richmond, Va.,  
 as second-class matter under act of Congress of  
 March 3, 1879.

MONDAY, OCTOBER 4, 1909.

THE GREAT FAIR.

There opens to-day on enlarged and improved grounds the greatest State Fair ever held in Virginia, and certainly one of the greatest ever held in the South. The steady growth and rapidly increasing importance of this annual agricultural and stock exhibit must be a source of profound satisfaction to any one capable of feeling a real interest in the progressive welfare of Virginia and Richmond. The thing was born in the minds of a handful of far-sighted men, and these men have had the gratification of seeing their dream, once nebulous and remote, gather body and strength, and impetus and finally blossom into the fullest flower of rich fulfillment. The State Fair of this year of grace is not merely a success; it is an overflowing and triumphant success; and what it is doing for the State, and in a much narrower way for Richmond, is really beyond measure.

Our friends in the country have sometimes thought that Richmond was a place apart, divided from them in some way and not interested in them. They were always wrong about this, and never so totally wrong as now. All day yesterday the roads leading to the Fair Grounds were thick and dusty, with people, eager people in trudging droves, who must have known that they could not get inside, since every gate was barred, and who could have hoped for nothing better than an occasional peep between the boards or a glimpse from the bridge over the railroad tracks. What all these people went out to see, what drew them all from their homes, was the work of the Virginia farmer. As individuals, they were enough interested in what the farmer is doing to make the journey out on the off chance of seeing a little bit of it. They embodied the eternal interest of the city in the work of the country, and those that went out yesterday are a drop in the bucket to those who will pour out there to-day and each day thereafter. All through this week Richmond will be thronged with visitors, the great majority of whom will come from the farms and the countryside and the smaller towns. There are no guests of any sort whom Richmond welcomes with a greater or more sincere pleasure. The coming of these thousands means more business for our merchants and hotels and car lines, and that, of course, is well; but bigger and better than that is the opportunity their presence gives for closer acquaintance, for strengthened relations and for a deepened sense of unity and fellowship. And so we bid our visitors a hearty welcome, a happy visit and a keen enjoyment of the great week-long display which they alone have made possible.

## TO PLACE THE CONFEDERATE MEMORIAL TO-NIGHT.

At its meeting to-night the Council will determine the very important question of the site of the Confederate Memorial, the crowning dedication of the whole South to its cause. Upon the result of to-night's deliberations will depend the location of this great building for all time to come.

The Times-Dispatch has no desire to seem fussy or opinionated. It has only one interest in the placing of this building. That interest has no selfishness in it, and it is shared, we are certain, by the thirty-five Councilmen in whose hands the responsibility rests. But since the subject is one of great importance to the city, the State and the South, now and into the far future, The Times-Dispatch ventures to revert to it once again.

There are two sites which have been most strongly favored, and it is between these that the choice now seems to lie. One of them is at the intersection of Monument Avenue and the Boulevard. The other is at the intersection of Monument Avenue and Rosemeath Road. The Monument Avenue site has already had the approval of the Aldermen. But it is to be said for the Rosemeath site, quickly to be reached and passed in the westward flow of the city, that it is on visibly higher ground than the Boulevard, which lies in a very evident depression; and that its more westerly position makes it much more appropriate for the consummation of all our memorials, removing the possibility that we should some day have to place a smaller monument behind it. These two reasons, so we think, are very cogent. Are they cogent? That is for the Council to decide. Each Councilman must determine for himself whether there are any reasons for the Boulevard site which outweigh them, and his obligation to decide this right is heavy and solemn. He is under a kind of moral pledge to the South of the present and the future to place this Memorial, not simply on an adequate site, but on the best site procurable. We trust that no Councilman will vote for the Boulevard site.

simply because the Aldermen have done so, or because it seems a good enough site; or because it may mean trouble to agree upon another one. We trust sincerely that no Councilman will vote for it without being thoroughly convinced, and able to convince others, that it is the best site that could possibly be procured.

## STRAIGHT TALK.

Of our statutory provisions governing the activities of coroners, Coroner Taylor, of this city, observes:

There is a foolish law requiring that the coroner have nothing to do with any case of death due to accident. For this reason even the inquest held by me yesterday might be considered in a sense as extra-judicial.

Dr. Taylor's adjective for this law is, if anything, unduly mild. How a coroner is to know whether a death is due to accident or not while scrupulously avoiding having anything "to do" with it the Solons who voted for this measure will have to explain to us.

He says further:

According to law the family of the deceased is required to stand all costs connected with an inquiry into the death. . . . I can only say that the provision . . . imposing the expense of an examination into the cause of death on estates is an abominable outrage.

The doctor here regains his accustomed pungency, and this time we have no complaint to make of enfeebled vocabulary. Again he is solidly right. It is the duty of society to determine whether a death is due to accidental or criminal causes, and the individual should have neither rights nor obligations in the matter.

The fact is that our law governing this important subject is badly defective, and the new Virginia Coroners' Association has its work all cut out for it.

## ON THE FAIR VS. IN THE CITY.

The lure of the city is generally the lure of imagined wealth. The young man on the farm reads of immense fortunes in the city, meets some boasting stranger who tells of large salaries for little work, and is seized with a desire to earn such a princely living. Comparing what he makes on the farm with what he thinks he can earn in the city, he importunes his father and ultimately leaves home.

Disillusionment generally follows. Months of weary waiting in the city, long hours in cramped offices, dreary evenings in cheap boarding houses, small salaries and disappointments are the lot of nine out of ten. Too late, perhaps, these men realize that they left happiness, health and comfort behind them on the farm.

But the fundamental misapprehension remains. Young men still think there is "more money" in the city. Perhaps this was true when farming was the desultory scraping of barren acres. It is no longer the case. Improved farming and better markets have made the farm, for the average man, a richer field of money-making than the city.

The truth of this statement can be illustrated by two recent instances which have come under our observation. One young man, with the usual limited education, left home, came to the city, took a course in a business college, waited three months for a position, and finally secured work at \$10 per month. At the end of the year his account stood as follows:

Cost of business education.....\$50  
 Boarding while studying.....25  
 Expenses while waiting for work.....75  
 Cost of living, seven months.....175  
 Clothing.....30  
 Total.....\$355

During this same period his earnings were \$250. The father on the farm had to make up the deficit. The same young man is working to-day for \$40 a month, with slim prospects for the future.

The other youth, just reaching manhood, remained at home and made a business agreement with his father. He was to work three days of the week for his father, and was to receive \$10 per month, his board and a plot of good land for his own use. At the end of the year he had raised and marketed a crop of tobacco worth \$200 and had sold small stock and poultry to the amount of another \$100. His living expenses had been low. He then bought himself a strong work horse and had \$150 in bank.

These cases are not exceptions. Facts are facts. The young man who came from the country bids fair to be a respectable clerk, earning, perhaps, \$100 a month before he is forty. The other will be a prosperous farmer, with a rich and well stocked farm. The one lost a golden opportunity. The other kept his and is making the best of it.

## MURDER FOR MERCY'S SAKE.

For the first time in modern history, so far as recorded, the doctrine of euthanasia has received a genuine legal sanction. It happened in Paris one day last week, when a Frenchman, on trial for murdering his wife, showed that he had killed her at her own request to put an end to her unendurable sufferings from disease. He was acquitted. That is to say, the jury decided that in such a case as this the taking of human life was entirely justifiable.

Is it? This is a question that has divided moralists from time immemorial. An agitation of it two or three years ago disclosed the fact that a very considerable number of persons in this country feel as the Paris jury felt. Advanced humanitarians can make out a pretty good case for their view. If a malady is absolutely incurable, and if it entails pain so extreme that living becomes only a life sentence to cruel torture, why shouldn't a painless end be put to it if the sufferer himself asks and begs for it? We give a dumb animal succor from his

misery with an anesthetic, and why not a human being? If a man is so afflicted in body that his life is an agony to himself and continuing anguish to his family, we commonly speak of his death as "merciful." Why should not the physician be encouraged to practice what we so freely call mercy in a higher power? But opposed to such arguments as these we have the certain knowledge that "incurable" patients sometimes get well, while a life once taken can never be restored; the clear perception that the licensing of merciful killing would offer a too convenient cloak for murder; and, stronger than these or anything else, we have that awe of the mysteries of the hereafter which makes even the surest of us shrink from the responsibility of deliberately returning any soul to its Maker.

The killing of weak or defective children was practiced by the Greeks, a noble and cultured people. But the Greeks did this for the good of the state, not the individual, and modern civilization has shown a steadily increasing recognition of the sacredness of all human life. It is possible that the pendulum may swing back the other way in generations to come, making us more "scientific" and less full of awe; but for the present euthanasia is interesting only as a point of debate for theorists and dreamers of dreams.

Why couldn't the game laws do something to football, Mr. Roosevelt?

Now it is said that the President's Winona speech did not make a sensation. In the name of Bismarck, Benson, whom did it help then?

Advices received in this city are to the effect that old Bill Skilitt, the famous agriculturist and Nimrod, who has been in Europe for the past year investigating the foreign markets, will return to his Haneyracker estates in time for the opening of the possum season.

The Providence Journal wants to know what foreigners must have of "Mr. Loeb's underlings" at the customs house. How well that man Loeb has caught on to having everything blamed on his employees!

"Poets in Indiana are writing about sparrows," says a Tennessee contemporary. Better that than about forty verses.

We see that a prominent Japanese visitor indorses the idea of a central bank for the United States. Well, it costs a Japanese nothing to indorse it.

We doubt very much, however, if this fellow Scott has the vocabulary to qualify him for heading a South Polar expedition.

Mr. Taft's request for simpler menus strongly suggests that he has not got the interior of his distinguished predecessor. This plea was never one of My Policies.

Well, we have always admitted that New York would be a nice town for the crowds.

Not knocking June at all, but October suits us pretty well, thank you.

Sometimes we half wish that Richmond people were more tolerant toward pennant-winning, but it's no use. The average Richmonder would rather be caught dead than within ten miles of a pennant.

Mr. Peary ought to use a better kind of hammer. Then he could nail without bruising his thumb.

Senator Aldrich is in Paris. We wonder if he is going to bed at 9 o'clock every night, like William Allen White.

Some of our esteemed contemporaries do not seem to like our recent editorial caption, "Bryan or What?" We are sorry, but we will not make it "Bryan or Bust" even to please them.

William H. Taft, of Cincinnati, will reach the people's hearts much more easily on a platform of high protection than a straightforward declaration for "beef and oil."

The livestock exhibition at the fair is going to be the greatest ever. Come on, you old bulls of Bashan, you!

## TAFT'S SHIP-SUBSIDY SCHEME.

President Taft has added another burden to Lord of the Next Congress.

President Taft has added steamship subsidy to his extensive program for the next session of Congress. There is no question as to the logical consistency of his position when he asks why we should not have steamship subsidy as well as a protective tariff. Why not, indeed? When hundreds of millions are extorted from the earnings of the masses of the American people to swell the coffers of the Steel Trust, the Sugar Trust and other greedy tariff beneficiaries, why balk at a few millions a year for ship owners?

Mr. Taft asks for a subsidy of only \$6,000,000 or \$8,000,000 a year as a beginning. This is a mere bagatelle compared with the tariff spoils. If he could tend, however, to the creation of a great trust on the high seas such as those that infest the land, so much the better in the estimation of our alleged economists, who regard the great combinations to monopolize trade and industry as the highest material development of modern civilization, although the rest of the world is far from so convinced.

But the serious drawback to the success of President Taft's subsidy plan will be in the difficulty to obtain a majority of the House in its favor. While the Democrats of the House are a unit in opposition to ship subsidy in all its forms, the Republicans of the Middle West are more hostile to it than ever. With the Senate the thing will be easy, as usual; but what Mark Hanna could not accomplish in the popular administration of McKinley and what Roosevelt himself failed to attain will hardly be in reach of Taft in the growth of the country's repugnance to this whole system of robbery. The argument which he draws from the tariff is far from tending to strengthen the plea for subsidy with the people, who detest the Payne-Aldrich bill. It is evident from the tenor of President Taft's subsidy speech that he has his own givings on the subject. The introduction of his ship subsidy scheme will widen the breach in the Republican majority in Congress there is no question.—Philadelphia Record.

## Borrowed Jingles

DAPHNE'S CHECK.

Speak not of Daphne's "check" check if favor at my hands you seek. I'll greet you with a stony stare, Or hoarsely wail the plaintive wail.

In such terms you dare to speak Of Daphne's check? No, no, no, no, I shall not raise the plaintive wail, I shall not call it "brown."

Or call it "brown," or call it "hay," I'll not utter what you say, I shall not even care if you Shall set it down as "rueful hay."

Without a word of mine, I'll be sure to speak of it as "hay." In certain lights, I can't deny, It does seem that way to the eye.

Or call it "brown," or call it "hay," I'll not utter what you say, I shall not even care if you Shall set it down as "rueful hay."

Without a word of mine, I'll be sure to speak of it as "hay." In certain lights, I can't deny, It does seem that way to the eye.

Or call it "brown," or call it "hay," I'll not utter what you say, I shall not even care if you Shall set it down as "rueful hay."

Without a word of mine, I'll be sure to speak of it as "hay." In certain lights, I can't deny, It does seem that way to the eye.

Or call it "brown," or call it "hay," I'll not utter what you say, I shall not even care if you Shall set it down as "rueful hay."

Without a word of mine, I'll be sure to speak of it as "hay." In certain lights, I can't deny, It does seem that way to the eye.

Or call it "brown," or call it "hay," I'll not utter what you say, I shall not even care if you Shall set it down as "rueful hay."

Without a word of mine, I'll be sure to speak of it as "hay." In certain lights, I can't deny, It does seem that way to the eye.

Or call it "brown," or call it "hay," I'll not utter what you say, I shall not even care if you Shall set it down as "rueful hay."

Without a word of mine, I'll be sure to speak of it as "hay." In certain lights, I can't deny, It does seem that way to the eye.

Or call it "brown," or call it "hay," I'll not utter what you say, I shall not even care if you Shall set it down as "rueful hay."

Without a word of mine, I'll be sure to speak of it as "hay." In certain lights, I can't deny, It does seem that way to the eye.

Or call it "brown," or call it "hay," I'll not utter what you say, I shall not even care if you Shall set it down as "rueful hay."

Without a word of mine, I'll be sure to speak of it as "hay." In certain lights, I can't deny, It does seem that way to the eye.

Or call it "brown," or call it "hay," I'll not utter what you say, I shall not even care if you Shall set it down as "rueful hay."

Without a word of mine, I'll be sure to speak of it as "hay." In certain lights, I can't deny, It does seem that way to the eye.

Or call it "brown," or call it "hay," I'll not utter what you say, I shall not even care if you Shall set it down as "rueful hay."

Without a word of mine, I'll be sure to speak of it as "hay." In certain lights, I can't deny, It does seem that way to the eye.

Or call it "brown," or call it "hay," I'll not utter what you say, I shall not even care if you Shall set it down as "rueful hay."

Without a word of mine, I'll be sure to speak of it as "hay." In certain lights, I can't deny, It does seem that way to the eye.

Or call it "brown," or call it "hay," I'll not utter what you say, I shall not even care if you Shall set it down as "rueful hay."

Without a word of mine, I'll be sure to speak of it as "hay." In certain lights, I can't deny, It does seem that way to the eye.

Or call it "brown," or call it "hay," I'll not utter what you say, I shall not even care if you Shall set it down as "rueful hay."

Without a word of mine, I'll be sure to speak of it as "hay." In certain lights, I can't deny, It does seem that way to the eye.

Or call it "brown," or call it "hay," I'll not utter what you say, I shall not even care if you Shall set it down as "rueful hay."

Without a word of mine, I'll be sure to speak of it as "hay." In certain lights, I can't deny, It does seem that way to the eye.

Or call it "brown," or call it "hay," I'll not utter what you say, I shall not even care if you Shall set it down as "rueful hay."

Without a word of mine, I'll be sure to speak of it as "hay." In certain lights, I can't deny, It does seem that way to the eye.

Or call it "brown," or call it "hay," I'll not utter what you say, I shall not even care if you Shall set it down as "rueful hay."

Without a word of mine, I'll be sure to speak of it as "hay." In certain lights, I can't deny, It does seem that way to the eye.

Or call it "brown," or call it "hay," I'll not utter what you say, I shall not even care if you Shall set it down as "rueful hay."

Without a word of mine, I'll be sure to speak of it as "hay." In certain lights, I can't deny, It does seem that way to the eye.

Or call it "brown," or call it "hay," I'll not utter what you say, I shall not even care if you Shall set it down as "rueful hay."

Without a word of mine, I'll be sure to speak of it as "hay." In certain lights, I can't deny, It does seem that way to the eye.

Or call it "brown," or call it "hay," I'll not utter what you say, I shall not even care if you Shall set it down as "rueful hay."

Without a word of mine, I'll be sure to speak of it as "hay." In certain lights, I can't deny, It does seem that way to the eye.

Or call it "brown," or call it "hay," I'll not utter what you say, I shall not even care if you Shall set it down as "rueful hay."

Without a word of mine, I'll be sure to speak of it as "hay." In certain lights, I can't deny, It does seem that way to the eye.

Or call it "brown," or call it "hay," I'll not utter what you say, I shall not even care if you Shall set it down as "rueful hay."

Without a word of mine, I'll be sure to speak of it as "hay." In certain lights, I can't deny, It does seem that way to the eye.

Or call it "brown," or call it "hay," I'll not utter what you say, I shall not even care if you Shall set it down as "rueful hay."

Without a word of mine, I'll be sure to speak of it as "hay." In certain lights, I can't deny, It does seem that way to the eye.

Or call it "brown," or call it "hay," I'll not utter what you say, I shall not even care if you Shall set it down as "rueful hay."

Without a word of mine, I'll be sure to speak of it as "hay." In certain lights, I can't deny, It does seem that way to the eye.

Or call it "brown," or call it "hay," I'll not utter what you say, I shall not even care if you Shall set it down as "rueful hay."

Without a word of mine, I'll be sure to speak of it as "hay." In certain lights, I can't deny, It does seem that way to the eye.

Or call it "brown," or call it "hay," I'll not utter what you say, I shall not even care if you Shall set it down as "rueful hay."

Without a word of mine, I'll be sure to speak of it as "hay." In certain lights, I can't deny, It does seem that way to the eye.

Or call it "brown," or call it "hay," I'll not utter what you say, I shall not even care if you Shall set it down as "rueful hay."

Without a word of mine, I'll be sure to speak of it as "hay." In certain lights, I can't deny, It does seem that way to the eye.

Or call it "brown," or call it "hay," I'll not utter what you say, I shall not even care if you Shall set it down as "rueful hay."

Without a word of mine, I'll be sure to speak of it as "hay." In certain lights, I can't deny, It does seem that way to the eye.

Or call it "brown," or call it "hay," I'll not utter what you say, I shall not even care if you Shall set it down as "rueful hay."

Without a word of mine, I'll be sure to speak of it as "hay." In certain lights, I can't deny, It does seem that way to the eye.

Or call it "brown," or call it "hay," I'll not utter what you say, I shall not even care if you Shall set it down as "rueful hay."

Without a word of mine, I'll be sure to speak of it as "hay." In certain lights, I can't deny, It does seem that way to the eye.

Or call it "brown," or call it "hay," I'll not utter what you say, I shall not even care if you Shall set it down as "rueful hay."

## Lord Maclefield Selling His Lands to Escape the New Tax.

Escapes the Clutches of a "Chorus Lady," Whose Affections He Shattered.

SWITZERLAND UNDECORATED.

Lord Maclefield Selling His Lands to Escape the New Tax.

By the Marquis de Montevideo.

THE NEW LORD Tweedmouth, who has hitherto been known as Major the Hon. Dudley Churchill, Marquis of the Royal Horse Guards, served with considerable distinction in the South African war, and has since been military secretary to Lord Selborne, the new governor-general of British South Africa. He is married to the Hon. Muriel Brock, eldest daughter of Lord Middleton, by whom he has two daughters, and his son, the Hon. Countess Marjoribanks, is now the heir to the barony. Lord Tweedmouth, whose mother was a sister of Lord Randolph Churchill, is a cousin of the Duke of Marlborough and of Winston Churchill.

His father, the late Lord, until the Kaiser's letter of the 10th of July, 1908, which cost him his \$25,000 a year cabinet office as minister of the navy, was one of the most familiar figures in English society, and in the political world. But his transfer from the admiralty to the infinitely less important post of lord privy seal, with a salary of \$10,000 a year, and especially the bitter criticism to which he was subjected in connection with the industrial revolution, led him to the desire to retire to his private life, and he was accordingly sold his lands to escape the new tax.

His father, the late Lord, until the Kaiser's letter of the 10th of July, 1908, which cost him his \$25,000 a year cabinet office as minister of the navy, was one of the most familiar figures in English society, and in the political world. But his transfer from the admiralty to the infinitely less important post of lord privy seal, with a salary of \$10,000 a year, and especially the bitter criticism to which he was subjected in connection with the industrial revolution, led him to the desire to retire to his private life, and he was accordingly sold his lands to escape the new tax.

His father, the late Lord, until the Kaiser's letter of the 10th of July, 1908, which cost him his \$25,000 a year cabinet office as minister of the navy, was one of the most familiar figures in English society, and in the political world. But his transfer from the admiralty to the infinitely less important post of lord privy seal, with a salary of \$10,000 a year, and especially the bitter criticism to which he was subjected in connection with the industrial revolution, led him to the desire to retire to his private life, and he was accordingly sold his lands to escape the new tax.

His father, the late Lord, until the Kaiser's letter of the 10th of July, 1908, which cost him his \$25,000 a year cabinet office as minister of the navy, was one of the most familiar figures in English society, and in the political world. But his transfer from the admiralty to the infinitely less important post of lord privy seal, with a salary of \$10,000 a year, and especially the bitter criticism to which he was subjected in connection with the industrial revolution, led him to the desire to retire to his private life, and he was accordingly sold his lands to escape the new tax.

His father, the late Lord, until the Kaiser's letter of the 10th of July, 1908, which cost him his \$25,000 a year cabinet office as minister of the navy, was one of the most familiar figures in English society, and in the political world. But his transfer from the admiralty to the infinitely less important post of lord privy seal, with a salary of \$10,000 a year, and especially the bitter criticism to which he was subjected in connection with the industrial revolution, led him to the desire to retire to his private life, and he was accordingly sold his lands to escape the new tax.

His father, the late Lord, until the Kaiser's letter of the 10th of July, 1908, which cost him his \$25,000 a year cabinet office as minister of the navy, was one of the most familiar figures in English society, and in the political world. But his transfer from the admiralty to the infinitely less important post of lord privy seal, with a salary of \$10,000 a year, and especially the bitter criticism to which he was subjected in connection with the industrial revolution, led him to the desire to retire to his private life, and he was accordingly sold his lands to escape the new tax.

His father, the late Lord, until the Kaiser's letter of the 10th of July, 1908, which cost him his \$25,000 a year cabinet office as minister of the navy, was one of the most familiar figures in English society, and in the political world. But his transfer from the admiralty to the infinitely less important post of lord privy seal, with a salary of \$10,000 a year, and especially the bitter criticism to which he was subjected in connection with the industrial revolution, led him to the desire to retire to his private life, and he was accordingly sold his lands to escape the new tax.

His father, the late Lord, until the Kaiser's letter of the 10th of July, 1908, which cost him his \$25,000 a year cabinet office as minister of the navy, was one of the most familiar figures in English society, and in the political world. But his transfer from the admiralty to the infinitely less important post of lord privy seal, with a salary of \$10,000 a year, and especially the bitter criticism to which he was subjected in connection with the industrial revolution, led him to the desire to retire to his private life, and he was accordingly sold his lands to escape the new tax.

His father, the late Lord, until the Kaiser's letter of the 10th of July, 1908, which cost him his \$25,000 a year cabinet office as minister of the navy, was one of the most familiar figures in English society, and in the political world. But his transfer from the admiralty to the infinitely less important post of lord privy seal, with a salary of \$10,000 a year, and especially the bitter criticism to which he was subjected in connection with the industrial revolution, led him to the desire to retire to his private life, and he was accordingly sold his lands to escape the new tax.

His father, the late Lord, until the Kaiser's letter of the 10th of July, 1908, which cost him his \$25,000 a year cabinet office as minister of the navy, was one of the most familiar figures in English society, and in the political world. But his transfer from the admiralty to the infinitely less important post of lord privy seal, with a salary of \$10,000 a year, and especially the bitter criticism to which he was subjected in connection with the industrial revolution, led him to the desire to retire to